

# ***City Council Meeting Minutes***

**December 6, 2016  
City Hall, Council Chambers  
749 Main Street  
6:30 PM**

**Call to Order** – Mayor Muckle called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

**Roll Call** was taken and the following members were present:

**City Council:** *Mayor Robert Muckle, Mayor Pro Tem Jeff Lipton, Councilmembers Jay Keany, Chris Leh (arrived 6:57 PM), Susan Loo, Dennis Maloney, and Ashley Stolzmann*

**Staff Present:** *Malcolm Fleming, City Manager  
Heather Balser, Deputy City Manager  
Kevin Watson, Finance Director  
Joe Stevens, Director of Parks & Recreation  
Aaron DeJong, Director of Economic Development  
Kurt Kowar, Director of Public Works  
Kevin Watson, Director of Finance  
Rob Zuccaro, Director of Planning & Building Safety  
Lauren Trice, Associate Planner  
Kristin Dean, Principal Planner  
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk*

**Others Present:** *Sam Light, City Attorney*

## **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

## **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mayor Muckle called for changes to the agenda and hearing none, moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Councilmember Keany. All were in favor. Absent: Leh

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

---

---

### ***City of Louisville***

*City Council    749 Main Street    Louisville CO 80027  
303.335.4533 (phone)    303.335.4550 (fax)    www.louisvilleco.gov*

Ted Hines, 318 South Place, stated he lives on a fixed income and has a problem with Western Disposal's large item collection. Western Disposal won't take items he feels should fit in their large item category. He feels the rules are arbitrary. They are not picking up items the web site says they will and if you drop them off they will charge you. He asked what his recourse is.

### **APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA**

MOTION: Mayor Muckle moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Councilmember Keany. All were in favor.

- A. Approval of Bills**
- B. Approval of Minutes: November 15, 2016**
- C. Approval of Resolution No. 66, Series 2016 – A Resolution Approving a Replat to Subdivide a Single 9.4 Acre Lot into Four Separate Lots Zoned Commercial Community (CC), Located at 133-165 South McCaslin Boulevard, Lot 1, Centennial Pavilions Filing No. 1**
- D. Approval of Resolution No. 67, Series 2016 – A Resolution Approving a Business Assistance Agreement with Corr-Jensen, Inc. for an Economic Development Project in the City of Louisville**
- E. Approval of Preliminary and Final Design Services Contract for Recreation Senior Center Expansion and Memory Square Swimming Pool Improvements**
- F. Approval of Owner's Representative Contract for Recreation Senior Center Expansion and Memory Square Swimming Pool Improvements**

### **COUNCIL INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS ON PERTINENT ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

None.

### **CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

City Manager Fleming stated someone on staff will get back to Mr. Hines regarding trash service.

### **REGULAR BUSINESS**

---

---

### **CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 68, SERIES 2016 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE MCCASLIN BOULEVARD SMALL AREA PLAN**

Director Zuccaro stated this is a revised plan based on Council input to date. This is the culmination of almost two years of development with a great deal of public input. Through the public process three things were identified as most in need of improvement

in the area: 1) sense of community, 2) sustainability, and 3) unique commercial areas and distinctive neighborhoods. This led to the creation of the project principals:

- Promote development to meet fiscal and economic goals
- Encourage desired uses
- Improve connectivity and accessibility
- Enhance bicycle and pedestrian connections
- Create public and private gathering spaces
- Create design regulations that reflect community vision and promote creative design including limiting density in transition areas

Director Zuccaro stated changes since the November 1 meeting are: removal of the roundabout at Dahlia and Cherry; and removal of mixed use residential on the east side of McCaslin. Since the October 18<sup>th</sup> meeting changes include removal of the lane reduction on McCaslin Boulevard; removal of the reduction of Cherry Street to one lane east of Dahlia; and revision of the statement on the creation of residential standards from “should” to “will.” Everything else remains the same from November 1.

He added the Finance Committee asked for more information about the land use assumptions that are the basis for the fiscal analysis. Staff evaluated current conditions in the area and compared them to the assumptions from the Plan and also looked at alternative assumptions that more closely reflect current conditions to get a feel for what could happen in the next 20 years. He noted the fiscal analysis is not intended to predict the building that may or may not occur, but rather it is to be used as a tool to understand what fiscal impacts there could be depending on what kind of development occurs.

Director Zuccaro stated this item could be adopted as presented this evening or with Council directing specific changes before publication or could be continued if there are items that need to be addressed or changed or additional information Councilmembers would like.

Jeff Sheets, Koelbel and Company, 5291 East Yale Avenue, Denver, presented the Council with some proposed redesign ideas for Centennial Parkway. He stated that as Centennial Parkway is in need of resurfacing, Koelbel is interested in partnering with the City to redesign the road to reduce speeds and encourage a more pedestrian-friendly environment. The proposal includes a large median, a 12-foot travel lane, a five-foot bike lane, and a parking lane. It keeps the left-hand turn lanes and keeps the lane configuration at the Via Appia and Cherry Street intersection.

Mr. Sheets noted some prospective tenants (particularly tech companies) have told them they would like more parking than the current configuration allows which is one reason they are interested in the reconfiguration with additional parking. He stated Koelbel passes on those tenants as they can't meet that parking need. The proposal would add about 265 parking spaces and would include the addition of pocket parks in

the large medians. A one-lane Centennial Parkway would serve the area well now and at build out.

Mr. Sheets stated the types of buildings encouraged in the Small Area Plan don't lend themselves to getting the types of tenants (tech companies) we are hoping to get. He added Koelbel is willing to pay for the difference between regular paving and the addition of these amenities and the reconfiguration.

Mayor Muckle asked if we are likely to see this area build out in 20 years. Mr. Sheets stated no, the current layout doesn't promote the types of uses people want and what developers are currently looking to build. Koelbel would like to develop office uses in the area, but there are parcels on the north side adjacent to existing residential that would be great for residential development and other parcels that might be good for a corporate campus of some kind as well as other office uses.

Mr. Sheets added he would like the City to update the design guidelines in the area to address heights and setbacks.

Mayor Muckle asked if the lane reduction would still serve the area at build out. Chris Hopkins, traffic engineer, Kimley Horn, stated their analysis of the lane reduction shows it still offers plenty of capacity for projected traffic volumes at build out.

#### Public Comment

Chris Haglin, 1068 Eagle Court, stated he has reservations about the Plan, specifically the lack of transit oriented development adjacent to the Bus Rapid Transit along US 36. The area needs first and final mile solutions and pedestrian access. A second issue is housing. If the City is going to have housing anywhere in town it should be next to the Bus Rapid Transit. This creates fewer vehicle trips and a greater use of the bus system. It also won't impact schools greatly as it will be designed for singles and couples, not families. Without including these items the only thing this Plan generates is traffic. Council needs to look at the long term value of housing at the Transit-Oriented Development/Bus Rapid Transit areas.

Sid Vinall, 544 Leader Circle, stated this has been a long process and it will be positive. The McCaslin Boulevard area is the major retail area for the City and we hope this plan will bring more businesses. The increased population growth and traffic is not going away but Louisville has been able to control growth better than some of our neighbors and keep our small town character. He supports the Plan as presented.

Audrey Debarros, 839 West Mulberry Street, stated she would like to see a vibrant, mixed use, pedestrian-friendly area but it is clear the community is not ready for multi-modal efforts and creativity in design. Land use decisions are being overrun by the fiscal model. The fiscal model is important but should not be the only consideration. She

asked that the Plan be continued and some efforts made to rethink some other options for the area other than the plan as proposed.

Larry Boven, 1108 Hillside Lane, and Laura Wolton, 1112 Hillside Lane, asked the Special Review Use option be put back in the Plan. In the past, it was used to allow for the development of the Enclave and Hillside Lane residential developments. We need more east-west connections from Hillside and the Enclave. We need more open space and mixed use development in this part of town. We need more connections with Davidson Mesa Open Space from the area. We need the Special Review Use to allow more options and flexibility in the area.

Frost Yarnell, 1109 Hillside Lane, stated she does not support mixed use in the area. She does not support continuing the Plan this evening as it has been years of work and she would like it approved as presented this evening. She does not support residential on the west side of town as it won't pay for itself. She encouraged approving the Plan tonight.

Councilmember Leh stated a great deal of time has been spent on this to date, and it has been very positive, but he doesn't think the Plan, as presented, is ready for a vote. He doesn't want to guess on a good answer for this, or do something just because some people want to hear that. This Plan as presented is not yet the best vision for Louisville. There are too many assumptions about what development might or might not occur and it doesn't take advantage of the Bus Rapid Transit and the Superior Towne Center. We aren't being creative and we should consider being more flexible. The Plan is not ready to go as presented tonight; it is too speculative.

Councilmember Maloney stated the Council has a responsibility to act on this given all the work put into it. But, he wants to make sure this is not too prescriptive a plan for the area. Things to consider include taking advantage of the Bus Rapid Transit, height limit changes for those that don't block others, and the fiscal impact study. This may not be the right time to approve it, but we are getting close.

Mayor Muckle stated he is ready to vote tonight. We can't know the future, but the work has been extensive and we can't keep people waiting. We can come back and reevaluate design guidelines or other things that could be changed. It is time to make some decisions. He supports the one-lane reduction on Centennial Parkway. He agrees with the concerns with the Transit-Oriented Development but there are no immediate requests for that type of development so we don't have an immediate issue. We could state in the Plan that we will revisit this area. He would like a vote this evening.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton said he has mixed feelings about the Plan. He supports taking out the residential areas east of McCaslin Boulevard. He agrees with the buffer zone between existing residential and the shopping areas and taking out the traffic circle. The changes on the east side of McCaslin Boulevard are good, but the west side of McCaslin Boulevard needs work and needs a process the public can weigh in on. The

west side needs a vision for the next 20 years that might include new design guidelines. There is more work to do in this area. We need more vision to include the Bus Rapid Transit and complete some Transit-Oriented Development in the area. He stated he fears we are becoming a gated community and not welcoming to newcomers. It's disingenuous to expect other communities to house all of our workers. We can't expect people to work here and then live elsewhere. We can't ignore the fact people need a place to live and work. He would like to approve the Plan for the east side of McCaslin Boulevard as presented, but continue work on the west side.

Councilmember Keany asked staff if the plan could be amended if it was passed as presented tonight. Director Zuccaro stated an amendment could be initiated in the future. Councilmember Keany asked how a new development in the area would be addressed if it doesn't meet the Plan. Director Zuccaro stated an amendment to the Plan could be considered concurrent with a development application. Councilmember Keany asked if part of the Plan could be approved without the other. Director Zuccaro recommended a redraft be brought for consideration at a later date rather than redrafting it during the meeting tonight.

Councilmember Keany stated the public is impatient and wants this Plan completed, but he doesn't think he can approve it as presented tonight. The Plan lacks vision. We need more input on building height and public input on such a discussion. He would really like to get this done, but the Plan is not ready tonight.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated she agrees with the mayor. She stated people don't necessarily choose to live and work in the same area so housing in that area will still require people commuting. She stated building heights were discussed during the process and the survey results showed no appetite for buildings higher than three stories. The Plan should be approved. It may not be perfect but it is a good compromise; and we would have something in place for land use decisions. The Plan leaves us a great amount of flexibility and there is a process to revise it.

Mayor Muckle added if the Plan is approved as presented the Council can continue to work on amendments in 2017.

Councilmember Loo stated she has been disappointed in this process and the Plan and would be in favor of waiting a little longer to make it better. By adopting it as presented, we are sending a message to anyone interested in coming to Louisville that we don't want to do anything different or innovative or show any flexibility. She doesn't want to do amendments later, she wants the Plan to be better before voting on it. We are very close to the end; give it a few more months to make it better before voting on it. There is no big rush, let's get it right. The east side of McCaslin Boulevard is probably good as is, but the west side needs more work. Get it right the first time even if it takes another six months.

Councilmember Leh said it doesn't make sense to only adopt part of the Plan; it likewise doesn't make sense to keep amending the Plan over and over. The residents aren't in so much of a hurry to pass this when important information could still be added to make a better decision.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton made a motion to direct staff to bring back a plan at the next meeting to approve the east side of the Small Area Plan and continue work on the west side. Councilmember Keany seconded the motion. Director Zuccaro stated it would be difficult to adopt a Plan that bifurcates the background information. Mayor Pro Tem Lipton withdrew the motion.

Mayor Muckle asked if it would be possible to adopt the Plan and include language that the west side of McCaslin Boulevard will be reevaluated.

Councilmember Maloney stated he would like a Plan for the whole area, not have one broken up in pieces.

Councilmember Leh made a motion to put the Plan on hold until after there can be a study session to which the public, landowners, and developers have all been invited to give input. He would like to delay any vote on the Plan until more information is gathered. Mayor Pro Tem Lipton seconded but stated it may require more time than just one study session. He would like it continued without the study session limitation. He made a friendly amendment to continue it until staff can bring it back with additional information. Attorney Light noted Council cannot have substantive discussion or give direction at a study session, for more flexibility it should be continued to a meeting (regular or special) for discussion/direction.

Mayor Muckle made an intervening motion to continue to the meeting of January 17. Seconded by Councilmember Keany. Councilmember Maloney offered a friendly amendment that height and setback limits be addressed at the next meeting. Mayor Muckle stated at the next meeting he would also like more information on Transit-Oriented Development.

Attorney Light asked if there were any objections to acting on the intervening motion first. No objections. A vote was taken and all were in favor of continuing the Plan until January 17<sup>th</sup>.

Director Zuccaro asked what items Council would like covered on January 17<sup>th</sup>. Members stated they would like to see Transit-Oriented Development principals and language and input from public and property owners about what would be beneficial to development of the business park.

## **721 GRANT AVENUE LANDMARK & PRESERVATION GRANT**

**RESOLUTION NO. 69, SERIES 2016 – A RESOLUTION DESIGNATING THE  
LOUISVILLE HOSPITAL LOCATED AT 721 GRANT AVENUE A HISTORIC  
LANDMARK**

**RESOLUTION NO. 70, SERIES 2016 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING A  
PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION GRANT FOR WORK ON THE LOUISVILLE  
HOSPITAL LOCATED AT 721 GRANT AVENUE**

Mayor Muckle introduced the item. Planner Trice stated this is a request for both a landmarking and a grant. The structure was moved from Main Street to Grant Avenue in 1905 and has a commercial, Italianate style that is unique. The grant request is for a foundation (it currently doesn't have one) as well as upgrading systems, altering the site drainage and restoring the exterior. The grant request exceeds the established maximum grant amount set by resolution; however the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) determined this meets the "extraordinary circumstances" definition due to the size of the structure, the fact the building was originally a commercial structure, and the cost of foundation work. Staff and the HPC recommend approval of both the landmarking and the grant.

Caleb Dickinson, 721 Grant, owner of the property, gave a brief presentation stating the structure has kept its integrity and look over time. The building has a great history including being the post office, the undertaker's parlor, hosting the town newspaper, and being a hospital. It is the only union associated building left in town. The rehabilitation is extensive given the state of the building and the need for a foundation to be put underneath the entire building. The plan is to take the building back to its original state.

Councilmember Loo asked why staff changed support for the grant from 50K (when presented to the HPC) to \$73K (as presented tonight). Trice stated the HPC was able to demonstrate there are "extraordinary circumstances." The HPC believed as this was previously a commercial building, and as the structure has issues similar to that of a commercial building, it met the "extraordinary circumstance" as the building is more a hybrid of residential and commercial.

Councilmember Loo asked if this is the highest amount ever asked for by a residential owner. Planner Trice stated, yes. Councilmember Loo stated she doesn't feel this building meets the commercial grant amount level. She stated the reason commercial building grants were designed to be higher than residential is because commercial buildings pay three and one-half times more sales tax than residential. She doesn't think this is "extraordinary circumstances" and it should not qualify for such a high amount. She suggested the owner look to the Historic Preservation Fund loan program for additional money.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated she supports the grant given the significant social and architectural history of the building. Mayor Muckle agreed.



Mayor Muckle asked for public comment. There was no public comment.

Councilmember Stolzmann moved to approve Resolution 69 to landmark the building. Mayor Muckle seconded the motion. Approved 7-0.

Councilmember Stolzmann moved to approve Resolution 70 approving the preservation grant. Mayor Muckle seconded the motion. Approved 6-1, Councilmember Loo voting no.

**RESOLUTION NO. 71, SERIES 2016 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING A FINAL PLAT FOR 4.39 ACRES WHICH INCLUDES A 1.91 ACRE FINAL PUD AND A SPECIAL REVIEW USE (SRU) WITHIN THE CORE AREA OF THE HWY 42 REVITALIZATION DISTRICT FOR 33 APARTMENTS AND 8 LIVE-WORK UNITS; A PORTION OF LOTS 2 THROUGH 5, BLOCK A, INDUSTRIAL AREA SUBDIVISION; LOT 101, LOUISVILLE TRADE CENTER; AND A PORTION OF LOT 4, BLOCK 13, CALEDONIA PLACE**

Planner Dean stated this is a request for a replat and special review use for the DELO lofts, located on Caledonia Street in the Revitalization Area. The property is zoned Mixed-Use Residential and the area is governed by the Multi-Use Development Design Standards and Guidelines (MUDDSG). This was approved by the Planning Commission in November with five conditions which have all now been met.

Planner Dean stated the northern portion of the property is the live/work units, with 33 apartments on the southern part of the property. The applicant is requesting six waivers. Staff supports approving these waivers for the pedestrian friendly aesthetic of the application and because the design meets the intent of the design guidelines. The parking requirement is met on site. All buildings meet setbacks except for the carports which need a waiver and, staff supports the waiver.

The PUD is moving forward with an interim condition plan and a final condition plan. The interim condition plan is what is being reviewed and ultimately what will be approved with this PUD and Plat. The final condition plan is for illustrative uses to show what parking and through access would look like with future development. It is not being approved by this PUD. This final condition plan has caused concern with the adjoining property owner, Louisville Tire. The PUD and Plat have been changed to clearly reference the easement under the original Louisville Tire Plat and PUD. Anywhere this condition plan is shown in this PUD there is a note that clearly states this is subject to review and approval under a separate PUD process.

Planner Dean noted a Special Review Use is required for first floor residential of the Live-Work units. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the Special Review Use.

Staff recommends approval with no conditions for this resolution.

Justin McClure, of RMCS, presented the applicant information. He showed renderings of the proposed area, reviewed the design requests, and discussed some history of the development in the area.

Mayor Muckle asked for public comments.

Greg Sommers, 708 Brooklawn Drive, Boulder, representing Louisville Tire, Cummings Flooring, and the Gallowa Family, stated they have concerns that new residents to the west will not like the existing industrial uses and they will complain there is no visual barrier from the residential area. The owners are also concerned about the access and parking changes that will affect their land. The owners are concerned about the possibility of conflicts with new residents. They request a barrier between the new development and the existing business be a part of the approval of the DELO Lofts.

Councilmember Maloney asked Mr. McClure what kind of barrier there is now. Mr. McClure stated it is a dilapidated fence that will be removed with development and replaced with a 30-foot landscaped barrier. He said a fence is not a good choice. The twelve spaces will be used by property owners on both properties just as they are used today. The property has more parking than required and the residents shouldn't create a parking demand on those twelve spaces.

Councilmember Stolzmann asked staff if the fence was discussed by the Planning Commission. Planner Dean stated that was not part of the discussion.

City Attorney Light asked that the photo Councilmember Maloney was looking at be posted for all to see as a part of the evidentiary record. A Google Earth image was provided showing the existing fence and parking spaces.

City Attorney Light noted there is a private access and parking easement in the area of the twelve spaces. That easement will continue with its current use even after this development is complete.

City Attorney Light reiterated the language on the PUD that the conditional Plan is conceptual only and is subject to approval, disapproval, or modification through a separate PUD amendment process. He noted the inclusion of the condition sketch in no way limits the discretionary authority of the City Council.

Councilmember Maloney moved to approve Resolution No. 71, Councilmember Loo seconded. Attorney Light noted an amended resolution was presented this evening without the condition. He suggested leaving the condition in the Resolution. Councilmember Maloney agreed and Councilmember Loo agreed. A vote was taken and all were favor.

**RESOLUTION NO. 72, SERIES 2016 – A RESOLUTION SETTING CERTAIN FEES, RATES, AND CHARGES FOR THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO**

City Manager Fleming noted fees are approved annually; some by the City Manager and some by the City Council. He stated on the Council-approved fee list one proposed change for discussion purposes is the “parking fee in lieu.” There are also format changes for liquor licensing fees and a change to the trash administration fee to cover increased costs.

For the City Manager-approved fees there are increases to the Recreation Center non-resident fees. This will be watched to see if it is appropriate or causes us to lose non-resident users.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated the Finance Committee reviewed the fees earlier and noted: 1) we appear to be collecting building fees that are in excess of what it costs to provide the service, and that will be looked into; 2) there is a small change to the reuse water rate which will affect golf and parks budgets for water; 3) she noted the Council should review fees prior to budget adoption and we will try that next year; and 4) she asked for a look at the parking fee in lieu to see if it is enough to meet needs.

She noted this item caused a great deal of discussion from the public. She added this fee is only used when a property is redeveloped and if parking cannot be accommodated on site. It is not an annual fee. The City has put a great deal of money into parking downtown at a very high cost. The Finance Committee asked staff for more information to see what it costs to build a parking space and what share of that cost should a developer pay. The number presented tonight is for discussion purposes.

Ronda Grassi, 916 Main Street, stated the \$28,000 cost is very concerning. In the past when this fee was raised to over \$10,000 it put a stop to all development at the time. She asserted the City has previously taken away parking for its own uses and not paid the high cost and also not provided enough parking for its own use. She stated many of these costs are prepared for the “what if” not the reality. This price will encourage people to scrape a building for a parking lot. Think about the future of parking and development not the current needs. Don’t kill downtown development and make a few developers pay 100% of the cost of parking everyone is using. Use other City funds to pay for parking.

Michael Menaker, 1827 West Choke Cherry Drive, stated he is a huge advocate for structured parking in downtown, but this is not the way to accomplish that. This number is not a true cost of parking in Louisville, but just for one specific lot; the number is artificially high. Also, developers wouldn’t pay that price for parking on land they don’t control. This Council should direct staff, the Revitalization Commission, and the Business Retention and Development Committee to begin working on serious parking options, a financing component, and downtown design guidelines. Economic

development depends on it. This fee should be continued until it can be fully fleshed out and there is broad public participation on this topic.

Randy Caranci, 441 Elk Trail, Lafayette, stated making this change now changes our entire development plan and was unexpected. Maybe \$3600 is not right, but an increase to \$28,000 is just too much. This should be put on hold or a lower increase should be considered.

Andy Johnson, 920 Lincoln Avenue, agreed with the other speakers; adding this is a huge concern for local landowners and stated the information was not well advertised. Such a high number could make redevelopment impossible for many. This fee needs much greater discussion.

Jim Tienken, 404 West Spruce Lane, stated as a landowner in downtown and an attorney representing other landowners he understands the cost of parking is high for everyone, but determining the final number should not be decided tonight. The issue merits greater discussion.

Mayor Muckle asked if there were any concerns about fees other than the parking.

Mayor Muckle stated he is torn about the non-resident fees for the Rec Center. We should keep an eye on that to make sure we aren't losing people. City Manager Fleming stated this is intended to maximize revenue, not discourage use. Mayor Pro Tem Lipton agreed with staff.

Mayor Muckle suggested staff investigate the parking in lieu fee to find a better option. \$3600 is too low, but we don't know what the right number is.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated this needs further conversation, it should be added to the 2017 work plan, and it should have an escalation process.

Councilmember Maloney moved to approve Resolution 72 but to reset the parking in lieu fee to \$3600. Councilmember Loo seconded the motion.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated she doesn't support the building fees as presented as they are excessive and bring in more money than it costs the City to provide the service. She planned to vote no because of this.

Roll call vote was taken and it passed 6-1. Councilmember Stolzmann voted no.

#### **DISCUSSION/DIRECTION/ACTION – BOARD AND COMMISSION INTERVIEW PROCESS**

The Mayor reported the Council received sixty-two applications for the 2017 board and commission vacancies. Interviews for the applicants are scheduled for Monday and

Tuesday, December 12 and 13 from 5:30 – 10 PM. Realistically the maximum number of people City Council can interview in a night is 26. To respect everyone's time he suggested appointing the following candidates without an interview:

1. **Historical Commission** – Appoint all five of the applicants (Allen, Ferris, Hooley, Keller, Teasdale). This board is each applicant's first choice and there are five spots available.
2. **Building Code Board of Appeals (BCBOA)** – Appoint Ed Novik as he is the only qualified building professional.
3. **Local Licensing Authority** – Reappoint the three members reapplying (Carlson, Lipton, and Machado). They are the only candidates for whom this board is their first choice.
4. **Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)** – Reappoint Haley and Thomas as they are the only applicants that meet the Preservation Professional standard needed for the board.

Councilmember Loo stated she understands the time constraints but would rather interview everyone perhaps with sectioning off certain boards for separate interview times. She doesn't want to change the interview process dramatically without applicants getting advance notice of what the changes will be.

Mayor Muckle noted he is not suggesting eliminating any applicants without an interview, but rather appointing some without an interview as they have certain skill sets or requirements we know a board needs.

Councilmember Keany agreed the BCBOA and HPC appointments as noted above make sense.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated he doesn't like the current process as it is not a good way to really get to know applicants. He would like to see a different process. He suggested perhaps asking the applicants to provide written answers to questions.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated she is not happy with the interview process and would rather see a more comprehensive approach.

Councilmember Maloney said given the fact the interviews are less than a week away, he proposed using the suggestion above and interview everyone else. Members agreed to that process.

Appointments to the various positions will be made at the December 20 City Council meeting to take effect January 1, 2017.

**TAKODA METRO DISTRICT 2016 SERVICE PLAN AMENDMENT PETITION –  
PUBLIC HEARING TO BE VACATED**

City Attorney Light explained the Takoda Metro District has a petition to amend the 2016 Service Plan to add a 0.87 parcel to the Metro District and planned to ask for Council approval of the amendment at this meeting. However, the District has now decided to wait until the pending replat of the property is complete and recorded before they proceed.

The District has advertised December 6 as the City Council public hearing for this item. As the item is not ready, the City Attorney recommended the Council vacate the public hearing. The item will come back to Council for consideration in 2017 once the replat is complete.

Motion Councilmember Stolzmann moved to vacate the public hearing, Councilmember Loo seconded the motion. Members voted 7-0 to vacate the public hearing.

**CONTRACT TO EXCHANGE REAL ESTATE WITH 608 STUDIOS, LLC**

**ORDINANCE NO. 1729, SERIES 2016 – AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE  
CONVEYANCE OF A PARCEL OF LAND OWNED BY THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE IN  
EXCHANGE FOR THE CONVEYANCE TO THE CITY OF A PARCEL OF LAND  
OWNED BY 608 STUDIOS, LLC – 1ST READING – SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR  
12/20/16**

**RESOLUTION NO.73, SERIES 2016 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING A CONTRACT  
TO EXCHANGE REAL ESTATE BETWEEN THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE AND 608  
STUDIOS, LLC FOR THE EXCHANGE OF PORTIONS OF PROPERTIES LOCATED  
AT 608, 612, AND 624 MAIN STREET – CONTINUE TO 12/20/16**

City Attorney Light introduced the ordinance by title on first reading. Councilmember Keany moved to approve the ordinance on first reading and set the public hearing for December 20. Councilmember Leh seconded the motion. Members voted 7-0 to approve.

Members continued Resolution No. 73 to December 20.

**CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT**

Attorney Light clarified a supermajority is needed to adopt an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. This is why five votes are needed to approve the Small Area Plan.

**COUNCIL COMMENTS, COMMITTEE REPORTS, AND IDENTIFICATION OF  
FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Councilmember Stolzmann reported on the recent meeting of the Louisville Superior Joint Issues Committee.

Councilmember Maloney reported on the meeting of the Impact Fee Study Committee. He also suggested perhaps the Recreation Expansion project needs a citizen advisory committee.

Councilmember Leh noted the Senior Board is having a concert on January 14, 2017 as a fund raiser this winter to replace the previous Heat Relief event. He added he is working with the Police Department and the District Attorney's Office on a "safe communities" meeting in Louisville in the New Year.

### **ADJOURN**

Members adjourned the meeting at 10:50 p.m.

---

Robert P. Muckle, Mayor

---

Meredyth Muth, City Clerk